



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0068

Issued Date: 07/30/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Professionalism (Policy that was issued 07/16/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.100 (I.A) Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Patrol Officers – Responsibilities (Policy that was issued 07/20/10)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.100 (I.A) Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Patrol Sergeant – Field Supervision (Policy that was issued 07/20/10)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

Unknown employees working on duty were alleged to have slept in the precinct parking lot.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the department, alleged that an unknown employee was sleeping in the precinct parking lot while on duty and that an unknown supervisor was allowing this to occur.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the referral from the Force Review Board
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of an SPD witness employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

A comment had been made by a witness SPD employee during a Force Investigation Team interview that other employees were sleeping on duty in the precinct parking lot. This interview occurred at least five hours after this employee's normal shift would have ended. Upon being specifically asked, the witness SPD employee clearly said that he had not actually seen officers sleeping on duty and knew that his supervisors would not condone it. Once the allegation had been made, an appropriate investigation by OPA was required to determine the validity of the comments.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the event had not occurred as alleged. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Professionalism*.

Allegation #2

The weight of the evidence showed that the event had not occurred as alleged. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Patrol Officers – Responsibilities*.

Named Employee #2

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the event had not occurred as alleged. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Patrol Sergeant – Field Supervision*.

NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.